

Appl. No. 10/ 613,371  
Amdt. Dated March 19, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 USC sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicant's claimed invention is directed to a thin magnetic recording medium having a magnetic recording layer that is 50 nm or less and wherein an angle  $\theta$  which is a growth direction of magnetic particles in a longitudinal cross-section of said magnetic layer with respect to a line normal to said nonmagnetic support, satisfies the following relation:

$$\theta_i - \theta_f \leq 25^\circ$$

where  $\theta_i$  is an angle of initial growth for said magnetic layer, and  $\theta_f$  is an angle of final growth for said magnetic layer, and

and further wherein a deposition range is restricted such that a maximum incidence angle  $\alpha_i$  and minimum incidence angle  $\alpha_f$  satisfies the relationship:

$$\alpha_i - \alpha_f \leq 25^\circ.$$

Additionally, by this amendment, applicant has submitted new claim 2 which further specifies that there is an underlying layer that is comprised of binder residue having a specified particle size and density of surface projections. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, are substantially different than Applicants claimed invention. In particular, the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner, United States patent number 5,554,442 to Ishida is directed to a much different and thicker magnetic layer. Specifically, for example, see column 14 at lines 56-60. This portion of the prior art

Appl. No. 10/ 613,371  
Amdt. Dated March 19, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

reference specification notes that the thickness of the Co-O magnetic layer is preferably from 50 nm to 150 nm which contrasts sharply with the present invention and disclosure which indicates that such a thickness for the magnetic layer would result in undesired recording/reproducing properties. See specifically, pages 26-27 of the instant application.

In order to highlight these distinctions, Applicant has submitted new claim 3 which specifies that the magnetic layer is less than 50 nm in thickness. The prior art cited by the Examiner actually teach the way from this invention. Furthermore, the cited reference provides no teaching her suggestion whatsoever regarding the specified underlying layer of claim 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

3/19/06

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI**  
**BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 704-1890  
**Attorney for Applicants**